



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/729,786

12/05/2003

Daniel S. Rokusek

IS01182TC

2285

23330

7590

04/19/2006

MOTOROLA, INC.
LAW DEPARTMENT
1303 E. ALGONQUIN ROAD
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER

MANOHARAN, MUTHUSWAMY GANAPATHY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/729,786	Applicant(s) ROKUSEK ET AL.	
	Examiner Muthuswamy G. Manoharan	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 2/7/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 are considered. Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertion on Page 6-7 with the remarks, "In contrast, Holmes describes providing wireless protocol capability.... from the same attachment." Holmes teaches Bluetooth enabled wireless phone (items 110 (wireless Phone), item 302 (audio connector to provide an interface for audio, control and electrical power), item 106 (Bluetooth module included or near the phone to provide Bluetooth capability for the wireless phone) in Figure 5; Col. 8, lines 52-65).

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 are considered. Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertion on Page 7 with the remarks, "Holmes does not have a handset undocked condition".

Holmes teaches a handset (item 110 in Figure 1; Col. 3, lines 50-65) that is in communication with the wireless phone ("wireless phone", Col. 6, lines 63-64; item 127 in Figure 5; Col. 6, lines 56-65) via WPAN ("Bluetooth-enabled", Col 6, line 61; Col. 4, lines 34-40). Thus, Holmes teaches a communication session, wherein the communications sessions span from the handset to a remote communications device (item 127) using a WPAN communications link.

Holmes fails to teach the handset determining one of a docked condition and an undocked condition. However, Lilja teaches in an analogous art, the handset determining one of a docked condition and an undocked condition (Col. 3, lines 17-21). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention to have the handset determining one of a docked condition and an undocked condition. This modification makes the system very user friendly by reducing the number of operations to be performed by the operator of the vehicle.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-13, and 16-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes et al. (hereinafter Holmes) (US 6,636,749) in view of Lilja et al. (hereinafter Lilja) (US 5,991,640).

Regarding claim 1, Holmes teaches a method, comprising: providing a handset (item 110 in Figure 2) coupled to interface with a docking station (item 104 in Figure 2), initiating a communications session, wherein the communications session spans from the handset to a remote communications device (item 127 in Figure 2) using a WPAN communications link (Blue tooth module 106 in Figure 2; Col. 6, line 61), and out from

the remote communications device using a cellular link (Col. 6, lines 57-65); the handset translating between the WPAN communications link and the cellular link (Col. 5, lines 7-13, item 106 in Figure 5); if the handset is in the docked condition, the handset routing an audio component through the docking station (item 106 in Figure 1; Col. 8, lines 18-33); and if the handset is in the undocked condition, the handset routing the audio component through the handset (item 106 in Figure 5; Col. 8, lines 59-62). Holmes fails to teach the handset determining one of a docked condition and an undocked condition. However, Lilja teaches in an analogous art, the handset determining one of a docked condition and an undocked condition (Col. 3, lines 17-21). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention to have the handset determining one of a docked condition and an undocked condition. This modification makes the system very user friendly by reducing the number of operations to be performed by the operator of the vehicle.

Regarding claim 2, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 1. Holmes further teaches wherein the WPAN communications link utilizes a Bluetooth communications protocol (Col. 6, lines 25-27).

Regarding claim 3, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 1. Holmes further teaches the handset discovering and coupling to the remote communications device (item 127 in Figure 5) using the, WPAN communications (item 106 in Figure 5, Col. 6, lines 57-62) link.

Regarding claim 4, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim

1. Holmes further teaches, wherein the docking station is integrated with a vehicle (item 102 in Figure 2, Col. 4, line 12).

Regarding claim 7, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim

1. Holmes further teaches, initiating the communications session using a human interface element on the handset (Col. 4, lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 8, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim

1. Holmes further teaches, initiating the communications session using the handset (Col. 4, lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 9, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim

1. Holmes further teaches, initiating the communications session comprises the handset receiving a communication session request from the remote communications device (Col. 4, lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 10, Holmes teaches a handset (item 110 in Figure 2) coupled to interface with a docking station, comprising a computer-readable medium containing computer instructions for instructing a processor to perform a method of controlling a communications session, the instructions comprising (Col. 3, lines 46-65): initiating the communications session, wherein the communications session spans from the handset to a remote communications device using a WPAN communications link (Bluetooth module 106 in Figure 2; Col. 6, line 61), and out from the remote communications device using a cellular link (Col. 6, lines 57-65); the handset translating between the WPAN communications link and the cellular link (Col. 5, lines 7-13, item 106 in Figure

5); if the handset is in the docked condition, the handset routing an audio component through the docking station (item 106 in Figure 1, Col. 8, lines 18-33); and if the handset is in the undocked condition, the handset routing the audio component through the handset (item 106 in Figure 5; Col. 8, lines 59-62). Holmes fails to teach the handset determining one of a docked condition and an undocked condition. However, Lilja teaches in an analogous art, the handset determining one of a docked condition and an undocked condition (Col. 3, lines 17-21). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention to have the handset determining one of a docked condition and an undocked condition. This modification makes the system very user friendly by reducing the number of operations to be performed by the operator of the vehicle.

Regarding claim 11, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Holmes further teaches wherein the WPAN communications link utilizes a Bluetooth communications protocol (Col. 6, lines 25-27).

Regarding claim 12, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Holmes further teaches the handset discovering and coupling to the remote communications device (item 127 in Figure 5) using the, WPAN communications (item 106 in Figure 5, Col. 6, lines 57-62) link.

Regarding claim 13, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Holmes further teaches, wherein the docking station is integrated with a vehicle (item 102 in Figure 2, Col. 4, line 12).

Regarding claim 16, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Holmes further teaches, initiating the communications session using a human interface element on the handset (Col. 4, lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 17, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Holmes further teaches, initiating the communications session using the handset (Col. 4, lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 18, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Holmes further teaches, initiating the communications session comprises the handset receiving a communications session request from the remote communications device (Col. 4, lines 41-47).

Claims 5,6,14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes in view of Lilja and further in view of Huh et al. (hereinafter Huh) (US 2003/0008680).

Regarding claim 5, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 1. Neither Holmes nor Lilja teaches the handset is in the docked condition, initiating the communications session via voice recognition algorithm in one of the docking station and the handset. However, Huh teaches the handset is in the docked condition, initiating the communications session via voice recognition algorithm in one of the docking station and the handset (Abstract, lines 15-18; Paragraph [0055], lines 23-26). Therefore, it would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the process of initiating the communications session via voice recognition algorithm in one of the docking station and the handset. This modification

makes the handset a truly hands-free car kit and also provides a user-friendly access to the handset.

Regarding claim 6, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 1. Neither Holmes nor Lilja teaches the handset is in the docked condition, one of the docking station and the handset executing a noise reduction algorithm during the communications session. However, Huh teaches the handset is in the docked condition, one of the docking station and the handset executing a noise reduction algorithm during the communications session (Paragraph [0014], lines 5-10, Paragraph [0072], lines 42-47). Therefore, it would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the handset is in the docked condition, one of the docking station and the handset executing a noise reduction algorithm during the communications session. This modification improves the quality of the audio signals.

Regarding claim 14, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Neither Holmes nor Lilja teaches the handset is in the docked condition, initiating the communications session via voice recognition algorithm in one of the docking station and the handset. However, Huh teaches the handset is in the docked condition, initiating the communications session via voice recognition algorithm in one of the docking station and the handset (Abstract, lines 15-18; Paragraph [0055], lines 23-26). This modification makes the handset a truly hands-free car kit and also provides a user-friendly access to the handset.

Regarding claim 15, Holmes in view of Lilja teaches all the particulars of the claim 10. Neither Holmes nor Lilja teaches the handset is in the docked condition, one

of the docking station and the handset executing a noise reduction algorithm during the communications session. However, Huh teaches the handset is in the docked condition, one of the docking station and the handset executing a noise reduction algorithm during the communications session (Paragraph [0014], lines 5-10, Paragraph [0072], lines 42-47). This modification improves the quality of the audio signals.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Muthuswamy G. Manoharan whose telephone number is 571-272-5515. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



LESTER G. KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER